REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the office action dated October 29, 2007.

The examiner has rejected claims 1-23 and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lobiondo (U.S. Patent No. 5, 287,194) in view of Snipp (U.S. 5,699,495 and further in view of Torii (U.S. Published Application No. 20060155825).

Claims 1, 20, 23 and 27 are amended to correct possible ambiguities in the claim language.

Independent claims 1, 11, 20, 21, 23, 26 and 27 comprise the elements sending a print task from a first-network print system component to a second-network print system component wherein "printing devices in the second network are not detectable by computing devices in said first network." This element as well as others are not taught in the combination of Lobiondo, Snipp and Torii.

Lobiondo teaches a single-network system in which a system component acquires data regarding printers in the local network in which the component resides, which is now clearly distinguished from the presently claimed multiple-network system of these claims.

The examiner relies on Lobiondo to teach the limitation,

> "acquiring, with said local print system component, printer data for a plurality of second-network printers located in a second network wherein said plurality of second-network printers are not directly accessible to said local print system component, wherein said plurality of second-network printers are not detectable to computing devices in said first network and wherein said plurality of second-network printers are in communication with a second-network print system component located in said second network."

However, Lobiondo does not teach a plurality of printers in a second network, wherein the printer are not directly accessible to the local print system component and wherein the printers are not detectable to computing devices in the first network.

Lobiondo teaches (col. 3, lines 18-26) a "scheduler routine … used in conjunction with a network comprising a plurality of printers 10 … which are interconnected through a communication link 20 such as a Xerox Ethernet system." This phrase clearly describes a single network system wherein printers are directly accessible to the scheduler and detectable by a computing device in the network. This phrase also shows, in conjunction with Fig. 1, that communication link 20 connects the computing devices in the network and the printers in the same network. No second network is mentioned.

Lobiondo also teaches (col. 3, lines 41-48) a "scheduler … located within the network at the print server or at various local workstations within the network for analyzing the information relating to the job, the print jab data itself and known information about the current capabilities of all printing resources within the network." Clearly, all printing resources are detectable by a computing device in the network and there is no mention of a second network or second network devices.

Lobiondo further teaches (col. 3, line 64 – col. 4, line12) that the "scheduler is also responsive to the capability and availability of each printer on the network." Again, Lobiondo clearly states that the printers are detectable to a computing device on the first network and that the printers are directly accessible to that device.

The examiner relies on Snipp to teach

"sending said print task from said local print system component to said second-network print system component in said second network; and

sending said print task, from said second-network print system component in said second network, to at least one of said plurality of second-network printers in communication with said second-network print system component for printing."

However, Snipp is also a single-network system that does not comprise or teach a first network print system component acquiring data regarding second-network printers.

The examiner states that Snipp discloses second-network printers in Figs. 1 & 2 and Col. 2, line 64 to col. 5, line 23. However, Snipp, at this location and elsewhere, teaches a single-network system wherein the printers are detectable by computing devices within the network and the printers are directly accessible to computing devices in the network. Snipp does not mention a second network at all. Snipp discloses a workstation 12 and print server 16 that exist in the same network. In fact, Snipp states (col. 2, lines 56 -67) that the print server functions may run on the workstations 12 themselves. Fig. 1 clearly shows that the workstations 12 and print servers 16 exist on the same network. Line 24 in Fig. 2 distinguishes between the print server 16 and a workstation 12 and has no reference to a network boundary as implied by the examiner when he discusses a "server side of a network." Snipp teaches storage of printer resources, i.e., print driver components, on a print server. Snipp does not teach communication between a first network and a second network and does not teach sending a print job from a first network to a component in a second network. Furthermore, Snipp does not teach communication with printers in a second network that are not detectable to computing devices in the first network and wherein the printers are also not directly accessible to computing devices in the first network.

The examiner further relies on Torii to teach the limitation "wherein said plurality of second-network printers are not detectable to computing devices in said first network." It should

be noted that this limitation relates to the method of the claim as a whole and limits the nature or relationship between the first and second networks in the claim. The claimed invention functions to enable printing to a printer in a second network when the printer is not detectable to a computing device in the first network of the computing device. This method is enabled by the second-network print system component that communicates with printers in the second network and with a computing device in the first network.

However, Torii teaches a method for obtaining the status of network devices and publishing that status to a user. Torii uses the simple network management protocol (SNMP) to extract data from device management information databases (MIBs) in network devices. The information is then combined with a template in a markup language and displayed to a browser. While Torii does teach device detection and status management, Torii does not teach communication of a print job to a second network and distribution of that print job to a second-network printer, nor does Torii teach printing to a second-network printer when that printer is not detectable to a computing device in the first network where the print job is originated.

While Lobiondo teaches a method of distributing print jobs within a network, Snipp teaches a method for distributing a print driver from a print server within a network and Torii teaches a method of network device status detection, the combination of Lobiondo, Snipp and Torii does not teach all the elements in this claim. In particular, there is no teaching of sending a print job to a second network device and thereafter sending that print job to a printer on that second network from the second-network device.

Independent claims 11, 20, 21, 23, 26 and 27 and claims 2-10, 12-19 and 25, which are dependent thereon and comprise all the limitations therein, comprise similar elements to those

described in claim 1. Accordingly, those claims are allowable for the reasons stated above in relation to claim 1.

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott C. Krieger/

Scott C. Krieger
Reg. No. 42,768
Tel. No.: (360) 828-0589